arXiv:1609.01991v3 [physics.gen-ph] 21 Sep 2016

LTH–1095

F-Theory E_7, Heterotic String-Derived Vacua And Flipped $SO(10)$ In Horăva-Witten Theory

Johar M. Ashfaque[♠1]

[♠]*Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZL, UK*

Abstract

In this paper, E_6 and especially E_7 GUT are considered in the F-theory setting in view of the free fermionic construction of the $4D$ heterotic string. In particular, the NAHE-Based LRS model of [29,30] is revisited as an illustration where the starting point was taken to be the $N = 4$, $E_7 \times E_7 \times SO(16)$ which through the use of boundary condition basis vectors is reduced to obtain the flipped $SO(10)$ GUT symmetry.

We also seek to extend the results of [32] in the case of the flipped $SU(5)$ to home in on the flipped $SO(10)$ vacua in the Horăva-Witten theory where the E_8 gauge group on the observable sector decomposes as $E_8 \supset E_6 \times SU(3)$ with E_6 being the gauge group of the effective field theory. We find for the E_6 GUT symmetry, solutions of type A and solutions of type B where the Hirzebruch surfaces are considered for the base contrary to [32] where flipped $SU(5)$ vacua were studied and only solutions of type B were found. Moreover, no solutions are found in the case of the base being the del Pezzo surfaces. Furthermore, this goes hand in hand with the heterotic, low-energy string-derived effective model discussed in [2, 3].

[1]email address: jauhar@liv.ac.uk

1 Introduction

To break GUT symmetries in F-theory [8–10] to construct viable models, one can use Wilson lines [15, 22] or introduce a $U(1)$ flux corresponding to a fractional line bundle [16–21].

The basic ingredient for model building in F-theory is a space-time filling seven-brane which wraps a four-dimensional internal subspace of the six internal directions of the compactification where each lower-dimensional subspace provides an important model building element as can be seen from Table 1. An Abelian or a non-Abelian gauge flux of the rank greater than two can then be turned on in the bulk to break the gauge group [16].

Dimension	Ingredient	Complex Codimension	Enhancements
$8D$	Gauge Theory	1	-
$6D$	Matter	2	Rank 1
$4D$	Yukawa Couplings	3	Rank 2

Table 1: The key elements of model building in F-theory.

The aim of this paper is to present a study of the flipped $SO(10)$ model embedded completely in the E_6 and E_7 GUT but with a different accommodation of the SM representations in the **27** of E_6 in string-derived, heterotic low-energy effective models constructed in the free fermionic formulation.

1.1 F-Theory E_6

$$E_8 \supset E_6 \times SU(3)_\perp$$

with

$$\mathbf{248} \to (\mathbf{78},\mathbf{1}) + (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{8}) + (\mathbf{27},\mathbf{3}) + (\overline{\mathbf{27}},\overline{\mathbf{3}})$$

where the inhomogeneous Tate form for E_6 is given by

$$x^3 - y^2 + b_1xyz + b_2x^2z^2 + b_3yz^2 + b_4xz^3 + b_6z^5 = 0.$$

Here, the $SU(3)_\perp$ factor is considered as the group 'perpendicular' to the E_6 GUT divisor. In what follows assume semi-local approach where the E_6 representations transform non-trivially under the $SU(3)_\perp$. In the spectral cover approach the E_6 representations are distinguished by the weights $t_{1,2,3}$ of the $SU(3)_\perp$ Cartan subalgebra subject to the traceless condition

$$\sum_{i=1}^{3} t_i = 0$$

while the $SU(3)_\perp$ adjoint decomposes into singlets. All the various E_6 breaking patterns

$$\begin{aligned}
(1a)\ E_6 &\to SO(10)\times U(1) \to SU(5)\times U(1)^2 && (1.1)\\
(1b)\ E_6 &\to SO(10)\times U(1) \to SU(4)\times SU(2)\times SU(2)\times U(1) && (1.2)\\
(2a)\ E_6 &\to SU(6)\times SU(2) \to SU(5)\times SU(2)\times U(1) && (1.3)\\
(2b)\ E_6 &\to SU(6)\times SU(2) \to SU(4)\times SU(2)\times SU(2)\times U(1) && (1.4)\\
(2c)\ E_6 &\to SU(6)\times SU(2) \to SU(3)\times SU(3)\times SU(2)\times U(1) && (1.5)\\
(3)\ E_6 &\to SU(3)\times SU(3)\times SU(3) && (1.6)
\end{aligned}$$

reduce to one of the two extended MSSM models of rank 6

$$\begin{aligned}
E_6 &\to SU(3)\times SU(2)\times [U(1)^3]\\
E_6 &\to SU(3)\times SU(2)\times [SU(2)\times U(1)^2]
\end{aligned}$$

which are equivalent up to linear transformations.[2]

1.2 A String-Derived Low-Energy Effective Model

The string-derived model presented in [1–6] was constructed in the free fermionic formulation [7] of the four-dimensional heterotic string. The details along with the the massless spectrum and the superpotential can be found in [1] and therefore omitted here. It was shown that the space-time vector bosons are obtained solely from the untwisted sector and generate the observable and hidden gauge symmetries:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{observable}\ :&\quad SO(6)\times SO(4)\times U(1)_1\times U(1)_2\times U(1)_3\\
\text{hidden}\ :&\quad SO(4)^2\times SO(8)\ .
\end{aligned}$$

Under the decomposition $E_6 \to SO(10)\times U(1)_\zeta$, following from Table 2, the fundamental representation of E_6 decomposes as follows

$$\mathbf{27} \to \mathbf{16}_{+1/2} + \mathbf{10}_{-1} + \mathbf{1}_{+2}.$$

[2] see [13, 14] for example.

Field	$SU(3)_C$	$\times SU(2)_L$	$U(1)_Y$	$U(1)_{Z'}$
Q_L^i	3	2	$+\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$
u_L^i	$\bar{3}$	1	$-\frac{2}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$
d_L^i	$\bar{3}$	1	$+\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{4}{3}$
e_L^i	1	1	$+1$	$-\frac{2}{3}$
L_L^i	1	2	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{4}{3}$
D^i	3	1	$-\frac{1}{3}$	$+\frac{4}{3}$
$\bar{D}^i$	$\bar{3}$	1	$+\frac{1}{3}$	2
H^i	1	2	$-\frac{1}{2}$	2
$\bar{H}^i$	1	2	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{4}{3}$
S^i	1	1	0	$-\frac{10}{3}$
h	1	2	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{4}{3}$
$\bar{h}$	1	2	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{4}{3}$
ϕ	1	1	0	$-\frac{5}{3}$
$\bar{\phi}$	1	1	0	$+\frac{5}{3}$
ζ^i	1	1	0	0

Table 2: *The massless spectrum where the charges are displayed in the normalisation used in free fermionic heterotic string-derived models.*

The E_6 GUT symmetry can be broken following [11–14] as

$$\begin{aligned} E_6 &\to SO(10)\times U(1)_\zeta \\ &\to [SU(5)\times U(1)_{\zeta'}]\times U(1)_\zeta \\ &\to [SU(3)\times SU(2)\times U(1)_{\zeta''}]\times U(1)_{\zeta'}\times U(1)_\zeta \end{aligned}$$

and the SM representations are accommodated in the **27** of E_6 as

$$\mathbf{27} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{16}_{+\frac{1}{2}} & \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}} + \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{R}} = (Q, u^c, d^c, L, e^c, N) \\ & \to \binom{Q\ \ u^c}{e^c} + \binom{d^c}{L} + N \\ \mathbf{10}_{-1} & \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{H} \\ \mathbf{1}_{+2} & \mathcal{S} \to S \end{cases} .$$

1.2.1 The E_7 Enhancement: A Word

The enhancement $E_6 \to E_7$ where the extra matter transforms in the **27** representation of E_6 as can be determined from the branching rule

$$\mathbf{133} \to \mathbf{78}_0 \oplus \mathbf{1}_0 \oplus \mathbf{27}_{+1} \oplus \overline{\mathbf{27}}_{-1}$$

where the subscripts denote the $U(1)$ charges under the decomposition

$$E_7 \to E_6 \times U(1).$$

2 F-Theory E_7

$$E_8 \supset E_7 \times SU(2)_\perp$$

with

$$\mathbf{248} \to (\mathbf{133}, \mathbf{1}) \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{3}) \oplus (\mathbf{56}, \mathbf{2})$$

where the inhomogeneous Tate form for E_7 is given by

$$x^3 - y^2 + b_1 xyz + b_2 x^2 z^2 + b_3 y z^3 + b_4 x z^3 + b_6 z^5 = 0.$$

2.1 The E_7 Gauge Enhancements And Breaking Patterns

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta \;=\; z^9\big[&-1024 b_4^3 + \big(((b_1^2 + 4b_2)^2 - 96 b_1 b_3) b_4^2 \\ &+72(b_1^2 + 4b_2) b_4 b_6 - 432 b_6^2\big) z + \mathcal{O}(z^2)\big]\end{aligned}$$

	deg(Δ)	Type	Gauge Group	Object Equation
GUT	9	E_7	E_7	$S : z = 0$
Matter Curve	10	E_8	E_8	$b_4 = 0$

Table 3: The E_7 gauge enhancements. There are no interaction terms, and conclude that an E_7 GUT is not possible if we are only interested in the generic enhancements. For completeness $SU(5)$ and $SO(10)$ gauge enhancements can be found in Appendix A.

However, we are interested in the the breaking patterns of E_7 which following [31] are found to be

$$\begin{aligned}
(1a)\ E_7 &\to E_6 \times U(1) \to SO(10) \times U(1)^2 && (2.1)\\
(1b)\ E_7 &\to E_6 \times U(1) \to SU(6) \times SU(2) \times U(1) && (2.2)\\
(1c)\ E_7 &\to E_6 \times U(1) \to SU(3) \times SU(3) \times SU(3) \times U(1) && (2.3)\\
(2a)\ E_7 &\to SU(6) \times SU(3) \to SU(5) \times SU(3) \times U(1) && (2.4)\\
(2b)\ E_7 &\to SU(6) \times SU(3) \to SU(4) \times SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1) && (2.5)\\
(3)\ E_7 &\to SO(12) \times SU(2) \to SO(10) \times SU(2) \times U(1) && (2.6)\\
(4)\ E_7 &\to SU(8) && (2.7)
\end{aligned}$$

where 2.1 is of key interest since under the decomposition

$$E_7 \to E_6 \times U(1)_\delta$$

$$\mathbf{133} \to \mathbf{78}_0 \oplus \mathbf{1}_0 \oplus \mathbf{27}_{+1} \oplus \overline{\mathbf{27}}_{-1}$$

where the subscript denotes the $U(1)_\delta$ charge and under further decomposition

$$E_6 \to SO(10) \times U(1)_\zeta$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{27} &= \mathbf{16}_{+1/2} + \mathbf{10}_{-1} + \mathbf{1}_{+2},\\
\overline{\mathbf{27}} &= \overline{\mathbf{16}}_{-1/2} + \overline{\mathbf{10}}_{+1} + \mathbf{1}_{-2},
\end{aligned}$$

where the subscript denotes the $U(1)_\zeta$ charge.

3 The NAHE-Based Models: A Discussion

The NAHE set consists of five basis vectors:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{1} &= \{\psi_\mu^{1,2}, \chi^{1,\ldots,6}, y^{1,\ldots,6}, \omega^{1,\ldots,6} | \bar{y}^{1,\ldots,6}, \bar{\omega}^{1,\ldots,6}, \bar{\psi}^{1,\ldots,5}, \bar{\eta}^{1,2,3}, \bar{\phi}^{1,\ldots,8}\},\\
\mathbf{S} &= \{\psi_\mu^{1,2}, \chi^{1,\ldots,6}\},\\
\mathbf{b_1} &= \{\psi_\mu^{1,2}, \chi^{1,2}, y^{3,\ldots,6} | \bar{y}^{3,\ldots,6}, \bar{\psi}^{1,\ldots,5}, \bar{\eta}^1\},\\
\mathbf{b_2} &= \{\psi_\mu^{1,2}, \chi^{3,4}, y^{1,2}, \omega^{5,6} | \bar{y}^{1,2}, \bar{\omega}^{5,6}, \bar{\psi}^{1,\ldots,5}, \bar{\eta}^2\},\\
\mathbf{b_3} &= \{\psi_\mu^{1,2}, \chi^{5,6}, \omega^{1,\ldots,4} | \bar{\omega}^{1,\ldots,4}, \bar{\psi}^{1,\ldots,5}, \bar{\eta}^3\},
\end{aligned}$$

The basis vectors **1** and **S**, generate a model with the $SO(44)$ gauge symmetry and $N = 4$ space–time supersymmetry. The vectors $\mathbf{b_i}$ for $\mathbf{i} = 1, 2, 3$ correspond to the $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ orbifold twists. The vector $\mathbf{b_1}$ breaks the $SO(44)$ gauge group to $SO(28) \times SO(16)$ and the $N = 4$ space–time supersymmetry to $N = 2$. The vector

$\mathbf{b_2}$ then reduces the group to $SO(10) \times SO(22) \times SO(6)^2$ gauge group and the $N = 2$ supersymmetry is further reduced to $N = 1$. Furthermore, the basis vector $\mathbf{b_3}$ gives the decomposition $SO(10) \times SO(16)_1 \times SO(6)^3$ where we fix the GGSO projection coefficient in order to preserve the $N = 1$ space–time supersymmetry. Moreover, the sector, ξ, given by the linear combination

$$\xi = \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{b_1} + \mathbf{b_2} + \mathbf{b_3} \equiv \{\overline{\phi}^{1,\ldots,8}\}$$

together with the NS–sector form the adjoint representation of E_8 thereby enhancing the $SO(16)_1$. As a result, we obtain

$$SO(10) \times E_8 \times SO(6)^3$$

as the gauge group with $N = 1$ space–time supersymmetry at the NAHE level.

There are two classes of $SO(10)$ breakings found in the literature using the free fermionic construction of the heterotic string:

- Flipped $SU(5)$ [23], Pati-Salam [24], and Standard-like models [25–28];
- Left-right symmetric [29] and $SU(4) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ models [30].

We are interested not in the former, but in the later case where the starting point is the $N = 4$, $E_7 \times E_7 \times SO(16)$ obtained by the use of the basis

$$B = \{\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{2\gamma}\}$$

where

$$\mathbf{x} = \{\overline{\psi}^{\mathbf{1,\ldots,5}}, \overline{\eta}^{\mathbf{1,2,3}}\}$$

and

$$\mathbf{2\gamma} = \{\overline{\psi}^{\mathbf{1,2,3}}, \overline{\eta}^{\mathbf{1,2,3}}, \overline{\phi}^{\mathbf{1,8}}\}$$

and with the following choice of one-loop GGSO projection phases

$$\begin{array}{c} \\ \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{S} \\ \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{2\gamma} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{cccc} \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{S} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{2\gamma} \end{array} \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{array}$$

is reduced to

$$SO(10) \times U(1)_\zeta \times U(1)_\delta \times U(1) \times SO(4)^3 \times SO(16)$$

by introducing basis vectors $\mathbf{b_i}$ for $\mathbf{i} = 1, 2$ corresponding to the $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ orbifold twists.

4 E_6 From Heterotic M-Theory

A brief study of the existence of solutions with three generations and E_6 observable gauge group in the case of compactification on the torus-fibred Calabi-Yau over Hirzebruch surfaces with some remarks about the case where the base is taken to be the del Pezzo surfaces.

A nonperturbative vacuum state of the GUT theory on the observable sector is specified by a set of M-theory 5-branes wrapping a holomorphic 2-cycle on the three-fold. These 5-branes are then described by a 4-form cohomology class $[W]$ satisfying the anomaly-cancellation condition being Poincaré-dual to an effective cohomology class of $H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$ expressed as

$$[W] = \sigma_*(\omega) + c(F - N) + dN$$

where c and d are integers and ω is a class in the base manifold B and $\sigma_*(\omega)$ is the pushforward to X under σ [33].

5 The Hirzebruch Surfaces F_r

In this section, we consider the rules for constructing realistic, viable vacua with E_6 GUT symmetry where the base manifold B are taken to be the Hirzebruch surfaces, F_r. We arrive at the following conditions modified for the E_6 observable gauge group [32, 33]:

5.1 The Semistability Condition

The semistability condition offers a choice: either

$$\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$$

and

$$s \text{ even}, \ e - r \text{ even}$$

or

$$\lambda = \frac{2m-1}{2}, \ m \text{ even}, \quad r \text{ even}.$$

5.2 The Involution Conditions

The involution conditions are

$$\sum_i \kappa_i = \eta \cdot c_1(B = F_r) = 2e + 2s - rs.$$

5.3 The Effectiveness Condition

The effectiveness condition boils down to

$$s \geq 24, \text{ and } 12r + 24 \geq e$$

with

$$\sum_i \kappa_i^2 \leq 100 + \frac{9}{4\lambda} - 9\lambda$$

and

$$\sum_i \kappa_i^2 \leq 4 + \frac{9}{4\lambda} - 9\lambda + \sum_i \kappa_i.$$

5.4 The Commutant Condition

The commutant condition for E_6 becomes

$$\eta \geq 3c_1$$

which implies that

$$s \geq 6, \text{ and } e \geq 3r + 6.$$

5.5 The Three Family Condition

The three family condition reads

$$-rs^2 + 3rs + 2es - 6e - 6s = \frac{6}{\lambda}.$$

Solving the three family condition for e assuming that the value of s is known leads to

$$e(r;\lambda) = \frac{1}{2s-6}\left(rs^2 - 3rs + 6s + \frac{6}{\lambda}\right).$$

5.6 Space of Solutions of Type A

In this class

$$s \text{ even},\ e-r \text{ even},\ \lambda = \pm 1, \pm 3.$$

s	$e(r;\lambda)$
6	$3r+6+\frac{1}{\lambda} \in \mathbb{Z}$ $\lambda = \pm 1$
8	$4r+\frac{24}{5}+\frac{3}{5\lambda} \notin \mathbb{Z}$
10	$5r+\frac{30}{7}+\frac{3}{7\lambda} \notin \mathbb{Z}$
12	$6r+4+\frac{1}{3\lambda} \notin \mathbb{Z}$
14	$7r+\frac{42}{11}+\frac{3}{11\lambda} \notin \mathbb{Z}$
16	$8r+\frac{48}{13}+\frac{3}{13\lambda} \notin \mathbb{Z}$
18	$9r+\frac{18}{5}+\frac{1}{5\lambda} \notin \mathbb{Z}$
20	$10r+\frac{60}{17}+\frac{3}{17\lambda} \notin \mathbb{Z}$
22	$11r+\frac{66}{19}+\frac{3}{19\lambda} \notin \mathbb{Z}$
24	$12r+\frac{24}{7}+\frac{1}{7\lambda} \notin \mathbb{Z}$

Table 4: Solutions for $e(r;\lambda)$ for each value of $6 \leq s \leq 24$ and the corresponding appropriate choice for λ contd.

Clearly, the space of solutions of type A contains exactly one vacua over the

Hirzebruch surfaces for any allowed value of r.

5.7 Space of Solutions of Type B

In this class

$$r \text{ even}, \ \lambda = \pm\frac{1}{2}, \pm\frac{3}{2}.$$

We will only consider the cases where integer solutions to the three family equation are found. These are given by

$$s = 6, \quad e\left(r; \lambda = \pm\frac{1}{2}\right) = 3r + 6 + \frac{1}{\lambda} = 3r + 6 \pm 2.$$

5.8 Explicit Expressions

For $B = F_r$

$$\omega = (24 - s)S + (12r + 24 - e)E$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} c &= c_2 + \left(\frac{1}{24}(n^3 - n) + 11\right)c_1^2 - \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda^2 - \frac{1}{4}\right)n\eta(\eta - nc_1) - \sum_i \kappa_i^2 \\ &= 100 + \frac{9}{4\lambda} - 9\lambda - \sum_i \kappa_i^2 \\ d &= c_2 + \left(\frac{1}{24}(n^3 - n) - 1\right)c_1^2 - \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda^2 - \frac{1}{4}\right)n\eta(\eta - nc_1) + \sum_i \kappa_i - \sum_i \kappa_i^2 \\ &= 4 + \frac{9}{4\lambda} - 9\lambda + \sum_i \kappa_i - \sum_i \kappa_i^2 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$c_1^2 = 8, \quad \eta^2 = -rs^2 + 2es, \quad \eta c_1 = -rs + 2e + 2s$$

and c_1 denotes the first Chern class and c_2 denotes the second Chern class.

6 del Pezzo Surfaces dP_N: A Word

We very briefly remark on the results. From [32] it can be seen that the first Chern class can be defined as

$$c_1(dP_N) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} M_i$$

with the three family condition being

$$-2\sum_{i=1}^{N} m_i^2 + n\sum_{i\neq j} m_i m_j - 2n\sum_{i=1}^{N} m_i = \frac{6}{\lambda}$$

which for $\lambda = \pm 1, \pm 3$ will not admit any integer solutions and therefore no vacua exists.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we looked at the E_6 and E_7 GUTs in view of the free fermionic construction of the $4D$ heterotic string. An illustrative example, that of the NAHE-Based LRS model of [29, 30] was briefly reviewed where the starting point was taken to be the $N = 4$, $E_7 \times E_7 \times SO(16)$ which was reduced to obtain the flipped $SO(10)$ GUT symmetry albeit with a different accommodation of the SM representations in the **27** of E_6.

In light of [2,3], we also considered the existence of solutions with three generations and E_6 observable gauge group. By use of Wilson lines the E_6 GUT symmetry can be broken to $SO(10)\times U(1)$. We found solutions of type A and solutions of type B which follow from the semistability condition, one of crucial ingredient when constructing realistic vacua contrary to [32] where flipped $SU(5)$ vacua were studied and only solutions of type B were found. It was also shown that no solutions can be found in the case of the base being the del Pezzo surfaces.

8 Acknowledgements

J. M. A. would like to thank String-Math 2016 organisers hosted in Paris and IGST 2016 organisers hosted in Berlin for their warm hospitality.

A The Gauge Enhancements

A.1 $SU(5)$

$$\Delta = -z^5\big[P_{10}^4 P_5 + zP_{10}^2(8b_4P_5 + P_{10}R) + z^2(16b_3^2b_4^2 + P_{10}Q) + \mathcal{O}(z^3)\big]$$

$$P_{10} = b_5$$
$$P_5 = b_3^2 b_4 - b_2 b_3 b_5 + b_1 b_5^2$$
$$R = 4b_1b_4b_5 - b_3^3 - b_2^2 b_5$$

	deg(Δ)	Type	Gauge Group	Object Equation
GUT	5	A_4	$SU(5)$	$S : z = 0$
Matter Curve	6	A_5	$SU(6)$	$P_5 : P = 0$
Matter Curve	7	D_5	$SO(10)$	$P_{10} : b_5 = 0$
Yukawa Point	8	D_6	$SO(12)$	$b_3 = b_5 = 0$
Yukawa Point	8	E_6	E_6	$b_4 = b_5 = 0$
Extra	7	A_6	$SU(7)$	$P_5 = R = 0$, $(b_4, b_5) \neq (0, 0)$

Table 5: The $SU(5)$ gauge enhancements.

A.2 $SO(10)$

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta &= -16b_2^3b_3^2z^7 + \big(-27b_3^4 - 8b_1^2b_2^2b_3^2 + 72b_2b_4b_3^2 \\ &\qquad +4b_1b_2(9b_3^2 + 4b_2b_4)b_3 + 16b_2^2(b_4^2 - 4b_2b_6)\big)z^8 \\ &\qquad +\mathcal{O}(z^9) \\ &= z^7\big[-16b_2^3b_3^2 + \big(-27b_3^4 - 8b_1^2b_2^2b_3^2 + 72b_2b_4b_3^2 \\ &\qquad +4b_1b_2(9b_3^2 + 4b_2b_4)b_3 + 16b_2^2(b_4^2 - 4b_2b_6)\big)z \\ &\qquad +\mathcal{O}(z^2)\big]\end{aligned}$$

	deg(Δ)	Type	Gauge Group	Object Equation
GUT	7	D_5	$SO(10)$	$S : z = 0$
Matter Curve	8	D_6	$SO(12)$	$P_{10} : b_3 = 0$
Matter Curve	8	E_6	E_6	$P_{16} : b_2 = 0$
Yukawa Points	9	E_7	E_7	$b_2 = b_3 = 0$ $b_3 = b_4^2 - 4b_2b_6 = 0$

Table 6: The $SO(10)$ gauge enhancements.

References

[1] A.E. Faraggi and J. Rizos, *Nucl. Phys.* **B895** (2015) 233.

[2] J. M. Ashfaque, "Axions And Self-Interacting Dark Matter In The Heterotic String-Derived Model," arXiv:1607.05769 [hep-ph].

[3] J. M. Ashfaque, "The Observed Diphoton Excess in F-theory Inspired Heterotic String-Derived Model," arXiv:1607.03076 [hep-ph].

[4] A. E. Faraggi and J. Rizos, "The 750 GeV di-photon LHC excess and extra Z's in heterotic-string derived models," Eur. Phys. J. C **76** (2016) no.3, 170.

[5] J. Ashfaque, L. Delle Rose, A. E. Faraggi and C. Marzo, "The LHC di-photon excess and Gauge Coupling Unification in Extra Z' Heterotic-String Derived Models," arXiv:1606.01052 [hep-ph].

[6] P. Athanasopoulos, A. E. Faraggi and V. M. Mehta, "Light Z in heterotic string standardlike models," Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) no.10, 105023.

[7] H. Kawai, D.C. Lewellen, and S.H.-H. Tye, *Nucl. Phys.* **B288** (1987) 1;
I. Antoniadis, C. Bachas, and C. Kounnas, *Nucl. Phys.* **B289** (1987) 87;
I. Antoniadis and C. Bachas, *Nucl. Phys.* **B289** (1987) 87.

[8] C. Vafa, "Evidence for F theory", Nucl. Phys. B **469** (1996).

[9] D. R. Morrison and C. Vafa, "Compactifications of F theory on Calabi-Yau threefolds. 1", Nucl. Phys. B **473** (1996).

[10] D. R. Morrison and C. Vafa, "Compactifications of F theory on Calabi-Yau threefolds. 2", Nucl. Phys. B **476** (1996).

[11] J. L. Hewett and T. G. Rizzo, "Low-Energy Phenomenology of Superstring Inspired E(6) Models," Phys.

[12] J. C. Callaghan and S. F. King, "E_6 Models from F-theory", JHEP **1304** (2013).

[13] C. M. Chen and Y. C. Chung, "On F-theory E_6 GUTs", JHEP **1103** (2011) 129 (2011).

[14] M. Drissi El Bouzaidi and S. Nassiri, "Breaking E_6 via trinification in F-theory", Fortsch. Phys. **63** (2015).

[15] C. Beasley, J. J. Heckman and C. Vafa, "GUTs and Exceptional Branes in F-theory - I", JHEP 0901 (2009).

[16] C. Beasley, J. J. Heckman and C. Vafa, "GUTs and Exceptional Branes in F-theory - II: Experimental Predictions", JHEP **0901** (2009).

[17] J. Marsano, N. Saulina and S. Schafer-Nameki, "F-theory Compactifications for Supersymmetric GUTs", JHEP **0908** (2009).

[18] J.˜Marsano, N. Saulina and S. Schafer-Nameki, "Monodromies, Fluxes, and Compact Three-Generation F-theory GUTs", JHEP **0908** (2009).

[19] J. Marsano, N. Saulina and S. Schafer-Nameki, "Compact F-theory GUTs with U(1) (PQ)", JHEP **1004** (2010) 095 doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2010).

[20] C. M. Chen and Y. C. Chung, "Flipped SU(5) GUTs from E_8 Singularities in F-theory", JHEP **1103** (2011).

[21] C. M. Chen, J. Knapp, M. Kreuzer and C. Mayrhofer, "Global SO(10) F-theory GUTs", JHEP **1010** (2010).

[22] Y. C. Chung, "Abelian Gauge Fluxes and Local Models in F-Theory", JHEP **1003** (2010) 006

[23] I. Antoniadis, J. R. Ellis, J. S. Hagelin and D. V. Nanopoulos, "An Improved SU(5) x U(1) Model from Four-Dimensional String," Phys. Lett. B **208** (1988) 209 Addendum: [Phys. Lett. B **213** (1988) 562].

[24] I. Antoniadis, G. K. Leontaris and J. Rizos, "A Three generation SU(4) x O(4) string model," Phys. Lett. B **245** (1990) 161.

[25] A. E. Faraggi, "Toward the classification of the realistic free fermionic models," Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **14** (1999) 1663.

[26] A. E. Faraggi, D. V. Nanopoulos and K. j. Yuan, "A Standard Like Model in the 4D Free Fermionic String Formulation," Nucl. Phys. B **335** (1990) 347.

[27] A. E. Faraggi, "A New standard - like model in the four-dimensional free fermionic string formulation," Phys. Lett. B **278** (1992) 131.

[28] A. E. Faraggi, "Hierarchical top - bottom mass relation in a superstring derived standard - like model," Phys. Lett. B **274** (1992) 47.

[29] G. B. Cleaver, A. E. Faraggi and C. Savage, "Left-right symmetric heterotic string derived models," Phys. Rev. D **63** (2001) 066001 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.63.066001 [hep-ph/0006331].

[30] G. B. Cleaver, A. E. Faraggi and S. Nooij, "NAHE based string models with SU(4) x SU(2) x U(1) SO(10) subgroup," Nucl. Phys. B **672** (2003) 64 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2003.09.012 [hep-ph/0301037].

[31] R. Slansky, "Group Theory for Unified Model Building," Phys. Rept. **79** (1981).

[32] A. E. Faraggi, R. S. Garavuso and J. M. Isidro, "Nonperturbative flipped SU(5) vacua in heterotic M theory," Nucl. Phys. B **641** (2002) 111.

[33] R. Donagi, B. A. Ovrut, T. Pantev and D. Waldram, "Standard models from heterotic M theory," Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **5** (2002) 93.